

REMARKS

This responds to the final Office Action dated 26 January 2005 and is accompanied by an RCE. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 1-7, 9-16, 18, 42, 44, 45, and 47-49 have been amended. Claims 1-5, 9, 13, 15, 16, and 18 have been amended only to change the dependency of each. Claims 19-41 and 46 were previously withdrawn. Claim 50 has been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-18, 42-45, and 47-49 remain pending in the application.

Allowable Claims

Applicant acknowledges the allowance of claims 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 17, and 45. Applicant also acknowledges that claim 11 would be allowable if “the microchip” is given proper antecedent basis. Claims 6, 7, 17, and 45 have not been amended and retain their original scope. Claim 10 was deemed allowable by the Examiner because “the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest in combination with the other claimed limitations a microchip adhere[d] to the core, wherein the microchip is wire-bonded to the electrically conductive transmission line.”

The current amendment expands the scope of claim 10, but claim 10 should still be allowable. Claim 10 recites the “microchip adhered to the core,” which the Examiner agreed is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Likewise, claims 11, 12, and 14 recite either a “microchip” or a “sensor chip” “adhered to the core” and should therefore be allowable as well.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner stated that the word “standard” is unclear. Applicant does

not agree that the term “standard” is indefinite. However, in an effort to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended claim 5 to remove the term “standard.”

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 9, 13, 15, 16, 42-44, and 47-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hedden, Jr. (U.S. 3,148,356) (hereafter “Hedden”). The Examiner alleged that Hedden discloses all of the elements recited in the rejected claims. The Examiner stated that Hedden discloses a core (12) comprising an electrical insulator, an electrically conductive transmission line (14) disposed across a portion of the external surface (Fig. 1) of the core (12), and an insulating mold (62, 64, Figs. 7, 8, 10, 11, 13 referring to a circuit board) disposed around the electrically conductive transmission line (14) and the external surface.

Applicant notes that Hedden teaches a hollow printed circuit board connector, not an “electrical feedthru,” and therefore should not be used as a basis for rejecting any of the claims. Nevertheless, claims 1-4, 9, 13, 15, 16, 47, and 48 have been amended and now depend from allowable claims 10 and 11. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 9, 13, 15, 16, and 48 should be allowable.

Regarding claim 42, the Examiner alleges that Fig. 13 of Hedden discloses a “disk extending between first and second distinct environments.” However, Applicant notes that claim 42 has been amended to positively recite “an electrical feedthru,” which is not taught or suggested by Hedden. Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion in Hedden that the connector 71 “extend[s] between first and second distinct environments.” In fact, the connector 71 disclosed by Hedden is incapable of extending between “distinct environments.” “Distinct” means “readily distinguishable from all others.” *The American Heritage® Dictionary of the*

English Language, Fourth Edition © 2000. An “environment” is “the circumstances or conditions that surround one.” *id.* The Hedden connector 71 is hollow, and the printed circuit board (or boards 30, 43 of Fig. 8, including the gap at 42) is open to atmosphere. Therefore, an equilibrium *must* be reached between any two locations the Hedden connector 71 traverses, and two “*distinct environments*” is impossible with any of the Hedden devices. Further, even if the Hedden connector 71 was not hollow (and the only actual disclosure is a “hollow” connector), all of the locations traversed by the Hedden connectors are open to the *same* environments. Accordingly, claim 42 (and claims 43 and 49 which depend from claim 42) should be allowable.

Similarly, claim 44 now positively recites “an electrical feedthru” in the body of the claim. Hedden does not disclose an electrical feedthru. In addition, claim 44 recites a disk with a “gradually tapered first end.” “Tapered” is defined as “to diminish or lessen gradually.” *id.* The Examiner cites Fig. 2 of Hedden for identical disclosure of a “tapered” disk. Fig. 2, however, exhibits an infinitely abrupt change in diameter, not a “taper.” Tapers are gradual, and Applicant has added the term “gradual” to further identify a taper, although it may be redundant. Moreover, the gradual taper is not simply a different shape with no articulated advantage. The specification clearly describes at least one advantage of the tapered shape. The specification and figures describe how the tapered shape facilitates a wedged or sealed insertion between distinct environments not offered by the Hedden device shown in Fig. 2. Accordingly, claim 44 should be allowable.


Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 8 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hedden in view of Bickford (U.S. 6,506,083) (claim 8) or Tower (U.S. 6,111,198) (claim 18). Claims 8 and 18 now depend from allowable claim 10, and should therefore be allowable.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all claims should now be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney if there are unresolved matters in the present application so that the examination process can be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,


D. Delos Larson
Registration No. 46,118

Date: 3/8/05

HOLLAND & HART LLP
555 - 17th Street, Suite 3200
P.O. Box 8749
Denver, Colorado 80201
Telephone: (801) 517-7843
Facsimile: (801) 364-9124